



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,873	12/13/2004	David Stock	PPD 70067	1342

26748 7590 03/08/2007  
SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION, INC.  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK DEPARTMENT  
410 SWING ROAD  
GREENSBORO, NC 27409

EXAMINER
----------

ARNOLD, ERNST V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1616

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/08/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/517,873

Applicant(s)

STOCK ET AL.

Examiner

Ernst V. Arnold

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/13/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 6-11 are pending. Claims 1-5 have been cancelled.

Applicants remarks filed on 12/11/06 are acknowledged. Applicant elected with traverse Group I now claims 6-10 for examination with a specific cyclohexanedione. Applicants traverse was on the grounds that the inventions are interrelated and that interrelationship rather than classification should be the overriding factor in determining the propriety of the restriction requirement. The Examiner cannot agree. The art teaches the instantly claimed composition, thus it was known in the art, and therefore unity of invention does not exist. The Examiner reminds Applicant about rejoinder of method claims *commensurate in scope* with allowed composition claims.

Claims 6-10 are presented for examination.

### ***Priority***

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

Art Unit: 1616

regards as the invention. It is unclear to the Examiner if the bond coming off the CH<sub>2</sub> is meant to bond to something or represents a methyl group. Clarification is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pallett et al. (WO 02/21919).

Pallett et al. disclose herbicidal compositions with the instantly elected cyclohexanedione, mesotrione (Abstract). Pallett et al. teach compositions comprising mesotrione and ethoxylated tristeryl phenol phosphate thus reading on instant claim 6 (Page 8, example C1). It is the Examiner's position that the proviso "when added" is an optional limitation.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1616

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rusch (WO 93/04585) in view of Wichert et al. (WO 0219823).

Applicant claims an herbicidal composition comprising mesotrione and organic phosphate, phosphonate or phosphinate adjuvant.

#### **Determination of the scope and content of the prior art**

##### **(MPEP 2141.01)**

Rusch teaches herbicidal compositions which comprise a phosphonate or phosphinate of  $(RO)_xP=O(R')_y$  (where x and y are each 1 or 2 and R and R' may be the same or different and each represent straight or branch-chained alkyl of 1 to 12 carbon atoms) used with herbicides (Abstract; page 11 example 3 and claim 1, for example).

Rusch claim the ethylhexyl derivative (Claim 2).

Art Unit: 1616

Wichert et al. teach mesotrione formulation (Abstract and claims 1-8). Wichert et al. teach adjuvants including organic phosphates, organic phosphoric acids and phosphoric acid (Page 4, lines 9-16).

**Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims  
(MPEP 2141.02)**

Rusch et al. do not expressly teach a formulation with mesotrione and an organic phosphate, phosphonate or phosphinate adjuvant.

**Finding of prima facie obviousness  
Rational and Motivation (MPEP 2142-2143)**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to add mesotrione, as suggested by Wichert et al., to the composition of Rusch and produce the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Rusch teaches that the compositions can contain one or more further active ingredients including herbicides (Page 5, second paragraph) and Wichert et al. teaches that mesotrione can be formulated with organic phosphate adjuvants. The selection of a particular organic phosphate, phosphonate or phosphinate is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization by one of ordinary skill in the art. Please note that the limitation of claim 6 "when added" reads as an optional limitation. It is the

Art Unit: 1616

Examiners position that one of ordinary skill in the art could formulate the composition taught by Rusch and Wichert to have the recited concentration as a spray tank additive.

A reference is good not only for what it teaches by direct anticipation but also for what one of ordinary skill in the art might reasonably infer from the teachings. (*In re Opprecht* 12 USPQ 2d 1235, 1236 (Fed Cir. 1989); *In re Bode* 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA) 1976).

In light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner concludes that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 USC 103(a).

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

Art Unit: 1616

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 6-8 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12 and 13 of copending Application No. 11/000,700. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application claims a composition comprising mesotrione and a phosphate adjuvant. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the obvious variation and overlap in subject matter with the instant application.

Claims 6-10 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 10/517,872. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application claims a composition comprising a metal chelate of mesotrione and a phosphate adjuvant (Claims 1 and 6). The types of phosphate, phosphonate or phosphinate adjuvants are described in copending claims 7-10. The Examiner notes the same structures for the phosphates in copending claim 7. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the obvious variation and overlap in subject matter with the instant application.



This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ernst V. Arnold whose telephone number is 571-272-8509. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:15 am-3:45 pm).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Art Unit: 1616

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ernst Arnold  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1600  
Art Unit 1616

  
JOHN PAK  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1200



Johann Richter, Ph.D. Esq.  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 1600